DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 381 SP 031 800

AUTHOR	Sutton, Jim
TITLE	Phase III: Where Do We Go From Here?
PUB DATE	1 Nov 89
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Beginning Teachers; Decision Making; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Merit Pay; *Professional Autonomy; Professional Development; Program Development; *School Based Management; *State Aid; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	*Iowa

ABSTRACT

Iowa has implemented educational reform by providing state financing without state mandates. This paper describes the achievements of Iowa's decentralized educational reform effort. Phase I of the reform effort provided salary relief to the beginning teacher, Phase II provided salary relief for the experienced teacher, and Phase III linked future salary relief to educational reform in such areas as performance based compensation and supplementary student-centered activities. The paper's three sections offer (1) a definition of Phase III; (2) a discussion of its specific achievements; and (3) a consideration of future steps. It is concluded that the "bottom up" approach to reform has built trust, promoted innovation, engendered diversity, raised salaries, and provided many worthwhile programs for students. However, it has not yet integrated its innovations in ways which promote systemic change at the building level. The ultimate success of Phase III will depend upon the ability of major stakeholders to provide support and leadership for comprehensive, interactive changes in school buildings. Central to this goal is the availability of additional time for teachers to participate in the demands of shared governance which systemic change will require. Time can be provided only if additional state support is sequestered as a restricted fund. This resource should be allocated to buildings and administered by building-level committees of teachers and administrators. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315381

Phase III: Where Do We Go From Here?

by Dr. Jim Sutton
The Iowa State Education Association
November 1, 1989.

SP 031 800

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Sutton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Phase III: Where Do We Go From Here?

by Dr. Jim Sutton
The Iowa State Education Association
October 1, 1989.

PURPOSE

This report considers three questions: (1) What is Phase III? (2) What has Phase III accomplished? and (3) Where do we go from here? It is for educators serving on local Phase III committees. Since many committees have new members, the report includes background about the passage of Phase III, because these original agreements among the stakeholders will bear upon local interpretations. The second section -- What has Phase III accomplished? -- is a review of Dept. of Education's studies, the ISEA's internal studies, and anecdotal evidence. The third section -- Where do we go from here? -- outlines one direction for the future.

I. WHAT IS PHASE III?

From 1980 to 1987, Iowa's school budgets were cut four times. These cuts, totalling $130 million, were equivalent to a $4,300 reduction in salary for each teacher employed in 1980. Iowa was increasingly uncompetitive with all states and adjacent states. In 1985-6, Iowa ranked 37th nationally in teachers' salaries, behind Florida, Georgia, Missouri, Alabama and Tennessee. Iowa salaries were $5,000 less than Illinois; $5,200 less than Minnesota; and $5,110 less than Wisconsin.

As a remedy, Gov. Branstad proposed a $100 million increase in teachers' salaries. Unlike governors in other states, Branstad invited the ISEA, the

Dept. of Education, and the School Board Association to establish the parameters for the legislation. The unprecedented coalition produced these agreements:

1. Legislation would provide salary relief for the beginning teacher, the experienced teacher and the developing teacher.

2. The relief would continue from year to year so as to provide a continuous and assured source of financing for salary relief and educational reform.

3. The salary target would be to bring Iowa's average teachers' salary up to the national average.

4. Appropriations would be for salary relief for the first year, and salary relief linked to educational reform in future years.

5. Educational reform was operationalized as salary items: supplemental pay for extra duties, performance-based pay, or a composite. Supplemental pay could be used for professional development; and performance-based pay, while undefined, could be used for innovations in pay plans and not exclusively for individual merit pay.

6. Appropriations would be made without centralized state mandates. Emphasis would be on decentralized innovation by local groups of educators, board members, parents and members of the community. Local persons would be trusted to reform schools. Reform would be "grassroots."

7. Reform legislation and salary relief plans would not modify the authority of a school board or a bargaining agent. What was bargainable would remain bargainable, and the bargaining process would be honored. Because of timelines, however, a special process would be utilized in the initial year.

8. The Department of Education would oversee the process, but rules promulgated by the Department would be minimal and would not expand on the enabling legislation.

9. Funds could be used to supplement existing programs, but could not be used to replace existing dollars.

10. Districts would receive a grant for processing the legislation and salary plans. This rate would be the district's existing indirect cost rate with the Department (about 2% - 4%).

11. Funds would be distributed to districts on a faculty Full-time Equivalent (FTE) basis.

Legislation incorporating these agreements was enacted by the Iowa Legislature and signed by the Governor.

Legislative intent is stated in the preamble to House File 499, "The Iowa Educational Excellence Act."

> "It is the intent of the General Assembly that school districts. . . incorporate into their planning . . . implementation of recommendations from recently issued national reports relating to the requirements of the educational system for meeting future education needs, especially as they relate to the preparation, working conditions, and responsibilities of teachers, including but not limited to assistance to new teachers, development of teachers as instructional leaders in their schools and school districts, using teachers for evaluation and diagnosis of other teachers' techniques, and the implementation of sabbatical leaves."

Phase I of the legislation provided a minimum salary of $18,000 for every teacher beginning in 1987-8. Phase II provided approximately $1,100 per teacher as a general pay increase. Phase III provided additional compensation to teachers through voluntary participation in a performance-based pay plan, supplemental pay for additional activities, or both. Phase I provided salary relief to beginning teachers; Phase II provided salary relief to developing and experienced teachers; Phase III linked additional future salary relief to educational reform. This was in accord with the systems approach to change advocated by the Carnegie Report, "A Nation Prepared," as referenced in the intent language of H.F. 499. Iowa was the first state to provide state funds for decentralized educational reform without centralized state mandates. Also, the ISEA was the first national or state teachers' organization to endorse the Carnegie report without reservation.

In a memo from ISEA Administrative Lobbyist Jan Reinicke, the actions of the Iowa Legislature on Phase III during 1989 were reported as follows:

1. Additional payments for minimum salary supplements are provided under Phase I to school districts who added teachers as a result of whole grade sharing agreements if the sum allocated for Phase I exceeded the sum required to pay for Phase I.

2. Salary payments, except for certain Phase III payments mutually agreed upon through collective bargaining, are subject to the wage collection law.

3. Phase III payments for performance-based pay plans may now be paid to all of the teachers in a school district based upon a specific academic discipline and to teachers in an area education agency multi-disciplinary team.

4. Phase III moneys can be paid to area education agency teachers who are under contract to the school district.

5. The deadline for submission of Phase III plans and reports by area education agencies is changed from July 1 to September 1.

6. School districts may use Phase III funds to supplement programs in existence prior to July 1, 1987, provided the funds area used to expand these programs, are eligible under Phase III guidelines, and are part of an approved Phase III plan.

7. The Department of education will summarize Phase III plans and make them available upon request.

8. Payments to local districts for Phases I, II and III are changed from a quarterly to a monthly basis, starting on October 15 and ending on June 15 of each fiscal year, contingent upon the state's financial position.

9. A district may retain up to 50% of the moneys allocated for Phase III for one year after the year in which they are received.

10. Districts may not co-mingle Phase III money with state aid payments and shall account for Phase III moneys separately from other moneys received.

II. WHAT HAS PHASE III ACCOMPLISHED?

1. Summary of Available Information.

In November of 1987, ISEA's Unit Two UniServ Unit surveyed and analyzed Phase III plans in north central Iowa. Its report included information on composition of citizens' (planning) committees; meetings held to date; duration of plans; allocation of Phase III monies to supplemental, performance

based or composite pay plans; study of performance-based in the future; teachers' attitudes toward the Phase III plan; administrative attitudes; inclusion of Phase III in current negotiations for future years; and nature of ISEA assistance which local leaders might require. Of thirty-nine associations responding, eleven failed to provide reports or had not advanced sufficiently to report. The others indicated a wide variety of committee configurations; an average of four meetings; an opening emphasis on supplemental pay plans with some discussion of performance-based plans; "favorable" to "excellent" response by rank-and-file members; co-operative or hard-line positions by administrators, but not both; seventeen locals negotiating Phase III concurrently with citizens committee activities; performance-based pay study committees in seventeen districts; and thirteen requests for assistance, only two of which were alike. The survey indicated a great activity and divergence underway. The survey was taken early in the implementation process.

In its report of February 29, 1988, the Iowa Dept. of Education indicated that all fifteen Area Education Agencies (AEA's) and all but nine school districts qualified to participate in the program by the January 1988 deadline. Sixty-six percent of the plans were for two or more years. In the schools, 371 plans (86.9%) were for supplemental work or professional training; 3 (0.7%) were for performance-based pay; the remaining fifty-three (12.4%) were for a combination of supplemental and performance-based pay. All plans with supplemental pay plan included staff development activity; ninety-seven percent include curriculum development activities; eighty-one and nine-tenths percent propose to study performance-based pay; seventy-three and three-tenths percent included additional teaching and instructional duties;

and fifty-two percent included teacher developed enrichment activities for students. Three districts submitted plans containing only performance-based pay components. Two of these involve accumulation of points for merit pay. In the composite plans, forty-five percent are designed around attainment of single or multiple individual goals; thirty-eight percent involve performance evaluation; nineteen percent involve peer review; seventeen percent involve a career ladder; seventeen percent involve building level goals; eleven percent involve individual activities; and eight percent involve student achievement.

In the AEA's, twelve plans (80%) were supplemental pay plans which provided for additional work and training; and three (20%) provided for a combination of performance-based pay and supplemental pay. All plans provided for differential pay. The twelve supplemental pay plans included staff development activities; eleven of these involved curriculum development, and ten involved study of performance-based pay. Teacher-developed activities were referenced in nine of these. Eight planned staff development through meetings and workshops; seven provided college credit for continuing education requirements for renewal of teaching licenses; six provided college credit for content; and four provided for locally developed staff development. Four also provided for additional teaching or instructional activities. Three AEA's submitted plans which combine supplemental pay with performance-based pay. All of these include staff development, curriculum development and performance-based pay.

In identifying future plans, eighty-three and six-tenths percent of school districts indicated that curriculum development was a need; eighty-two percent indicated staff development as a need; eighty percent identified studying and implementing a performance-based pay plan. Needs were similarly ranked for AEA's. In current plans, the Department noted several weaknesses. Many

proposals lacked depth and specificity in program evaluation, and many plans were returned for improvement in process and/or product evaluation. Process evaluation examines whether a district did what it proposed; product evaluation considers the impact of Phase III on students.

In April of 1988, the ISEA surveyed its membership on the initial effects of Phase III and the attitudes of teachers. Five hundred sixty-four teachers responded by mail out of 1,225. Of 100 responding to to following questions, eighty-seven percent said that their plan included a school improvement component; eighty-two percent said that it included site-based decision-making; and seventy-eight percent said it included career development. Fifty-nine percent said their plan included performance-based pay, of whom sixty-six percent indicated the plan rewarded individuals, fifty-two percent rewarded group performance, and sixty-two percent studied performance-based pay without making a recommendation.

Over 90% of those responding agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements: enacting an $18,000 minimum salary for teachers was a positive move (93% of 552); funding Phase II was a good accomplishment (97% of 540); Phase III "will help me become a better teacher" (91% of 527); "I support career development for teachers paid by local districts" (91% of 533); a committee of teachers and administrators should make decisions relating to requests by teachers for funding professional activities under Phase III (93% of 530); and ISEA should take a leadership role in educational reform (95% of 523). Over 90% <u>disagreed</u> or <u>strongly disagreed</u> with the statement that teachers "asked for too much" (93% of 121).

Over 75% agreed or strongly agreed with the following: Phase II funds were distributed in an equitable manner (87% of 546); components of performance-based pay were an issue in Phase III (76% of 516); ISEA provided sufficient

support in the local development of Phase III plans (76% of 488, although only 50% actually reported requesting assistance); having local control on the development of Phase III was helpful (86% of 517); seeking a ratification vote of the teachers on a Phase III plan was useful (82% of 503); the respondent supported site-based management and decentralized decision-making (84% of 495); the respondent supported community involvement in school reform (83% of 527); and the respondent supported the Phase III plan actions which were taken in the district (76% of 520). Seventy-eight percent of 171 said the presence of community members caused problems. Over seventy-five percent of those responding disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that Phase III changed the structure of the school district (83% of 505).

Other questions indicated that fifty-three percent of 533 agreed or strongly agreed that they opposed merit pay in any form. Sixty-seven percent of 509 agreed or strongly agreed that education in Iowa would be improved as a result of Phase III. Fifty-three percent of 487 disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that Phase III had a positive effect on the district's relationship with the community. Fifty-three percent of 524 said the legislature should eliminate performance-based pay from Phase III.

In March of 1989, the ISEA's East Central UniServ Unit conducted a Phase III survey. Its results are as follows:

> "The results have been tabulated from a recent teacher survey received from 25 East Central schools concerning their Phase III plans. 29% of the teacher members responded to the survey. 32% of the teacher respondents said they were relatively satisfied with their Phase III plans while 68% showed various kinds of dissatisfaction. The inequities and pressures of Phase III plans were obvious from the number of teachers who took time to write comments. There is general agreement that the variety and extent of the opportunities provided through Phase III need to be expanded.
>
> "The majority of teachers believe an equitable Performance Pay plan probably cannot be developed and the likelihood of success is not very encouraging. There are 2 districts, Linn-Mar and Grant Wood AEA, piloting a performance-based pay program this year.

"An overwhelming majority feel that Phase III requires too much time for the money received. Time, or lack of it, is the biggest frustration factor, and many comments reflect the pressure and anxiety teachers are feeling."

In April of 1989, the ISEA surveyed teachers at its Delegate Assembly. Although the population was skewed in that it consisted of teachers who were leaders and possibly more informed and active than teachers generally and the sample was relatively small, some useful data was generated. Of 105 respondents, seventy indicated that, as a result of Phase III, they had participated in professional development; fifty-three answered that they had attended summer school, in-service activities, workshops or state curricular meetings; thirty-three had instructed summer school or had worked service hours in extra-curricular areas; fifty-six had developed new programs; forty-four had worked on district committees; thirty had earned performance-based pay; and twenty had benefitted in other ways.

Respondents were asked to comment in an open-ended way. Their responses indicated a high degree of involvement and satisfaction at many levels. Almost all of the responses indicated a combination of professional development, in-service and compensation. Many involved students directly or through curriculum design, often including computers. Comments indicated a wide range of activity at the local level.

Also in April, the ISEA invited leaders and bargainers from its twenty-five largest associations to identify successes and weakness on Phase III. This conference -- representing half the teachers in the state -- concluded that Phase III was enhancing the professional status of teachers by providing growth opportunities. The opportunities were providing a foundation for teachers to be innovative in areas of

educational reform within their district. Teachers were broadening their base of knowledge about teaching and research and applying that knowledge within their schools, affecting student growth positively. The program's voluntary aspect gave teachers "ownership" for their own professional development and was strengthening their self-perceptions as professionals.

Success varied from district to district and depended on focus; clarity within a plan's design; trust; collaborative climate; administrators' attitudes; and teachers' ownership. Students were being given additional opportunities to improve academic performance as a result of tutorials; extended day programs; enrichment programs, such as extracurricular activities; and additional activities during summers.

Opportunities for professional growth were being enhanced as a result of new teacher mentoring; peer coaching; credit and noncredit courses and workshops; inter-relation of district and personal goals; development of new programs; the creation of structured clinical experiences; research; grant projects; travel; demonstration teaching programs; summer schools and institutes; sabbaticals; new professional roles, such as curriculum specialist; and new curriculum development and co-ordination.

Instructional leadership among teachers was being enhanced through Phase III activities which promoted collaboration, participation, shared decision-making; autonomy; and ownership. Morale, leadership skills, and pride were improving noticeably. Professional effort was being recognized in such activities as career ladder programs; per diem pro rate pay for extra duty; tuition reimbursement, including books and labs; extended contracts; and stipends.

Phase III was improving morale, pride and professionalism through voluntary participation; compensation for additional activities; expanded range of opportunities; program flexibility; collegiality; shared decision-making; sharing among teachers; opportunity for risk-taking; decentralized activity; and planning.

But antagonism increased in some situations and was directed at administrators or other teachers. Time was increasingly scarce. The change in role as teachers assume new responsibilities caused unrest and even turmoil. Lack of financing, imposition of merit pay by fiat, and inequality in rates of pay caused problems. Staff members often did not understand the district's Phase III plan, its implications or their role in it. The public may not have been kept informed. The wide range of experiments made it difficult to locate or share information with those conducting similar programs.

Inequities were perceived in the administration of some plans as well as inconsistencies in the approval process for individuals. There was inadequate compensation for planning. Attempts by administration or a teacher elite to control the process were counter-productive. Antagonism increased between teachers and a school board or its administrators, particularly where attempts had been made to impose plans or end-run bargaining. A lack of commitment occurred, with major players failing to take responsibility for encouraging participation. Administration attempted to control what was designed as a collaborative structure. Divisiveness occurred between and among stakeholders. The bureaucratic hoops in the approval process hindered programs by reducing flexibility in project design.

Activities may take time from the classroom or simply add to a teaching load. Burnout was a continuous risk. Non-joiners reaped benefits without effort, and intra-teacher grievances were possible. Performance-based pay may be defined too narrowly as merit pay. A lack of scheduled growth for Phase III funds meant inflation will reduce the program over time. When substitute teachers were financed from Phase III, this cut programs, as did the creation of new professional positions.

The conference recommended that educators observe and measure the effect of programs upon the growth of people. Educators need to monitor the administration of Phase III programs, particularly the process by which problems are identified, evaluated and solved. A system for communicating among districts and educators was essential, as districts "re-invented the wheel." Finally, practical fiscal matters -- relating to normal growth, increased costs, carryover procedures and impact on general funds -- needed to be considered.

In decision-making, participants asked for clearly defined educator roles; a stronger educators' voice in programs; mechanisms for meaningful participation by educators; greater co-operation among teachers and administrators; and more emphasis on site-based decision-making. In evaluation, participants asked for clearly defined educators' roles; increased co-operation among educators; and clear accountability. In problem-solving, participants asked for open dialogue; data collection; and more co-operation among educators.

In general, participants hoped the future of Phase III would bring professionalization through individual long-range evaluation and professional pride. They hoped the number of teaching teams and

participation by teachers and students would increase. They hoped projects would become building centered; student centered; related to specific teaching techniques; and lead to innovative teaching styles and materials for learning. They asked for a stronger role in planning; more flexibility in programming; and greater emphasis on research. Finally, they hoped that fiscal problems -- increased costs; per diem expenses; carry-over and general fund -- would be addressed.

In May of 1989, UniServ Unit II solicited open-ended comments from members on Phase III. Positive comments centered on opportunities to make more money, implement creative ideas, and make improvements in morale. Negative comments centered on the refusal of administrators to work bilaterally; attempts by administration to implement only proposals consistent with their own previously existing ideas about development; lack of time; inequitable distribution; fears about merit pay; concerns about using money as a motivator for professional effort; red tape; increased conflict among teachers; and questions about basic goals.

In May of 1989, the ISEA conducted an open-ended survey of local association presidents. The presidents -- responsible for over-seeing the implementation of Phase III for teachers -- were asked:

> "What is your most successful Phase III innovation? Why? Please describe it and indicate your reasons."
>
> "What is your least successful Phase III innovation? Please describe it and indicate your reasons."
>
> "What innovation is worthwhile, but will take a long time to implement? Please describe it and indicate your reasons."
>
> "What is the biggest problem you now face in implementing Phase III?"

"What does your association plan to do next in connection with Phase III?"

Sixty-three responses were received from 428 affiliates. Programs deemed "most successful" indicated a wide range of activities, and it was apparent that these programs were generated in response to needs perceived by specific groups or individuals. Projects deemed "most successful" included the entire range of programs, including student centered activities, computer technology projects, reimbursement for graduate courses, parent-teacher conferencing, TAG programs, extended kindergarten for high-risk students, career ladders, curriculum design, and merit pay "point" systems. No two "successful" programs were alike or remotely similar.

Programs deemed "most unsuccessful" centered on performance-based pay systems and the process of planning for Phase III, particularly community relations and involvement. Dissatisfaction was expressed with "packaged" school improvement/effectiveness programs and the quality of in-service and coaching programs. General dissatisfaction was expressed in areas over which teachers had no control or in which they participated passively.

Responses about "worthwhile innovations which will take a long time to implement" included curriculum, site-based decision-making, career ladders, performance-based pay, evaluation, and directive administration on Phase III program development and implementation. However, curriculum and planning for performance-based pay were most frequently mentioned.

Responses about future plans were varied and related to adjustments in process or to specific recommendations relating to the division of resources among existing or proposed categories of activity for compensation. Responses did not relate to new programs for Phase III, perhaps because they are now

under the purview of committees created for that purpose. However, many were concerned with implementing or studying performance-based pay.

In June of 1989, the ISEA conducted a second survey of its membership on Phase III. This survey was based on 331 responses from 885 questionnaires mailed to ISEA members on a random number basis. 46.2% of 305 respondents reported earning at least $1,000 as a result of Phase III; 39.3% between $1,000 and $2,000; 11% between $2,000 and $3,000; 1.6% between $3,000 and $4,000; and 1.6% more than $4,000.

The respondents did not respond to any question at the 90% level. At least 75% indicated approval or strong approval on the following: teachers known to the respondent are divided on the issue of performance-based pay (80.9% of 325); Phase III was a good thing (70.0%); and the respondent planned to remain in teaching (87.9%). At least 75% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the following: Phase III has provided more preparation time for teachers (87.8%); new programs outside of the school day distract from the classroom (79.6%); too much Phase III money is going to substitute teachers (86.3%); Phase III should be phased out (73.7%); Phase III has increased trust and rapport in the respondent's building (70.2%); not enough money is going to substitute teachers (88.3%); and teachers known to the respondent are suggesting new ideas (78.2%).

The respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the following: the respondent's students have new programs outside of the classroom; (57.2%); co-operation with building principals has increased (59.6%); teachers' relationships with the community have improved (68.4%); teachers and administrators are involved in a partnership (55.0%); antagonism with administrators has increased (56.8%); Phase III activities are more trouble

than they're worth (57.4%); Phase III should be expanded so that its programs interact to provide comprehensive school change (68.2%); the respondent has more flexibility in instruction (68.6%); and administrators have increased control over teachers (64.4%).

In September of 1989, the Roper Organization released the results of a poll of teachers in the Midwest. Commissioned by the Midwest Council of State Legislators, its report for Iowa found,

> "Iowa, of all Midwestern States, had the lowest percentage of educators who think that major changes are needed at the state level: only slightly over a third (35%) versus over half (55%) of Midwestern educators.
>
> "Sixty-five percent of Iowa educators surveyed think their state legislators have supported educational reform needed in their state, versus less than half of educators overall (45%).
>
> "Educators in Iowa (66%) have seen an improvement in state legislators' efforts to resolve their state's problems in education over the past five years (while six in ten Midwestern educators saw no improvement in legislative efforts).
>
> "Six in ten Iowa educators also rate the state favorably on the effort they believe it has dedicated to education reform within the last five years. Iowa educators also rate local school districts' and local school efforts toward educational reform more favorably than any other Midwestern State.
>
> "Educators were asked to rate 12 possible learning barriers to their students, on a scale from "1" to "10", where "1" means that it is not at all a learning barrier and "10" means that it is a major learning barrier for their students. Two problems listed high among educators in Iowa: students unstable family life - 6.0, and lack of parental involvement 5.1
>
> "Also, out of a list of a dozen problems, only three were considered problems by the majority of Iowa educators. Topping this list are alcohol abuse (59%), latch-key children (58%) and parental neglect (56%).
>
> "Educators in Iowa are split between thinking the state should have less involvement (34%) and that its involvement is "fine as it is" (33%).

"Educators in Iowa share the sentiment of most of their colleagues in the other Midwestern states, with majorities in Iowa desiring the state to become involved in more equitable school funding (74% are of this opinion), teachers' salaries (66%) and state-wide academic standards and regulations (51%).

"Of those legislators who said that there was "any specific legislation, program or local action" that their school had implemented which they felt had provided extensive help in improving education, 38% in Iowa listed "Phase I" and 11% noted "Phase II" as helpful. Phase I, II and III is in its 2nd year of implementation in Iowa, and involves raising teachers' salaries."

Iowa's teachers indicate relatively high satisfaction with educational reform, legislators, and state and local activities. Their perceptions about barriers to learning focus on things outside or beyond a school's influence. A major concern seems to be increased co-ordination among existing social welfare, medical and school organizations in areas such as drugs, nutrition, child abuse, child care and family stability.

In October of 1989, Marie Theobald, working for the Dept. of Education, prepared a monograph, "Phase III: Restructuring Iowa's Schools." After reviewing research on school improvement, she listed restructuring activities resulting from Phase III. She found no two Phase III plans were alike. She identified reform projects in local districts by a useful taxonomy, as follows:

A. Teaching and Learning.

1. Focus on outcomes:

Adel-DeSoto; Bedford; Dike; Linn-Mar; and Spencer, with ten districts in consortium for outcome-based education beyond Phase III (Adel-DeSoto; Cedar Rapids; Clinton; College Community; Council Bluffs; Des Moines; Linn-Mar; Maquoketa; South Tama; and West Marshall).

2. New and expanded roles for teachers:

Boone, Dumont; Newton; and Western Dubuque, with mentor teacher programs in Boone, Clinton, Muscatine, Nevada, Oskaloosa, Spencer, and Wall Lake.

3. Accountability for student achievement:

   College Community.

4. Personalized teaching and learning:

   a. TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) Projects: Everly; Durant; Grinnell Newburg; Lake View-Auburn; Muscatine; Newton; North Mahaska; and Wooden-Crystal Lake.

   b. At risk students: Adel-DeSoto; East Central; Hedrick; Howard-Winneshiek; Johnston; Lake View-Auburn; Nevada; St. Ansgar; and Wooden-Crystal Lake.

   c. Student-centered activities: many districts.

5. Applied research and development knowledge:

   a. Co-operative Learning: Ames; Ar-We-Va; Dubuque; Cherokee; Emmetsburg; Ft. Madison; and Howard-Winneshiek.

   b. Peer coaching: Ames; Adel-DeSoto; Clinton; Dubuque; Eddyville; Everly; Ft. Madison; Lake View-Auburn; Mar-Mac; Marion; Ottumwa; and West Marshall.

   c. Writing across the curriculum: many districts.

   d. Thinking skills: Cedar Falls; Dike; and Grinnell Newburg.

   e. Effective schools and effective teaching: Adel-DeSoto; Boone; Clinton; Denison; Dubuque; Eddyville; Everly; Glenwood; Howard-Winneshiek; Hudson; Johnston; Lewis Central; Marion; Nevada; Ottumwa; Spencer; Tri-center; and Underwood.

B. Organization and management.

   1. Focus at the building level:

      a. TET (Teacher Effectiveness Training): Ames.

      b. Group pay for group work: Davenport.

      c. Building-based goals: Ft. Madison; Grinnell-Newburg; Lewis Central; and Linn-Mar.

      d. Site-based decision-making: Mid-Prairie.

   2. New administrative roles and responsibilities: Saydel and St. Ansgar.

   3. Accountability for success of the organization: Manilla.

   4. Supportive educational climate: Dike; and Howard-Winneshiek.

5. Expanded community relationships: Bedford; Boone; Emmetsburg; Hedrick; Humboldt; Mason City; Montezuma; North Mahaska; Nevada; Saydel; Spencer; Storm Lake.

Theobald states, "Many districts funded activities to help meet the new state standards with Phase III funds." This, however, is not the purpose of the authorizing legislation. Phase I is a salary relief program; Phase II is a salary relief program; and Phase III is a salary relief program tied to reform. The use of Phase III funds for other purposes is beyond the scope of HF 499. Also, new state accreditation standards were passed prior to Phase III legislation. The bill's provision that Phase III funds "supplement and not supplant" existing programs applies to obligations incurred prior to the passage of Phase III, as is federal practice. All this suggests a need for local districts to review the permissible uses of Phase III.

2. Narrative Summary of Reports & Tentative Hypotheses.

It is perilous to generalize from incommensurate or incomplete data, but since a working hypothesis is necessary, the following is offered.

Early responses from the field indicated great optimism at high levels of consensus. As the work of implementing Phase III began, expectations became realistic. Planning led to polarization or to co-operation centering on the do-able. The simple was favored over the complex; the immediate was favored over the long-term; and, except in a few cases of polarization, consensus occurred. One important outcome was the development of administrator/teacher committees. With such committees, shared decision-making gained plenary or effective authority over the approval of professional development plans and distribution of supplemental pay.

This innovation, while feeding into bargaining and board governance, was not dependent on either. Because of the nonnegotiability of the original Phase III plan, friction developed with teachers because of ambiguities about their role or inability to effectively represent a point-of-view. Where teachers were not involved in a process or shut out from it, criticism resulted. This was reflected in negative attitudes toward community relations and involvement.

Many worthwhile initiatives on a wide spectrum of activities were undertaken. Generally, Phase III was used to meet previously unmet needs in professional development and student-centered activities. Each district developed a unique plan, and a diverse range of experiments was fostered, with no two plans being alike. Districts introduced new stimuli into educational reform with positive effects.

But innovations were unconnected. They re-inforced activities already planned or underway, or they met existing needs. Except for a few "lighthouse" districts, attempts were not made to integrate Phase III into a systems based approach to comprehensive school change involving many components. Few districts dealt with building-based evaluation, compensation, professional development or site-based decision-making; none integrated them into a single program.

Administrative attitudes were perceived as neither worse nor better because of Phase III. This is consistent with our hypothesis that systematic comprehensive change was not initially a result of Phase III. Time, while perceived as a serious problem, was not linked with more adults in the schools, such as substitute teachers. Respondents did not feel that "substitutes are being used too much" or that "too much money is being spent

on substitutes." This may be because the salary objective of Phase III takes precedence over the use of the same money to employ substitutes. It also suggests lack of connectedness among Phase III programs to affect systemic change. Where district-wide school effectiveness, improvement or in-service programs were viewed as marginal, teachers responded negatively.

In general, Phase III was used by districts to meet unmet identified needs. Projects, while providing a wide range of worthwhile activities, did not interact to promote comprehensive school transformation, except in a few districts. Salary relief was provided, as was a foundation for more complex and interactive reforms in the future; but failure to integrate Phase III into salary schedules created distrust, confusion and uncertainty about the sincerity and permanence of reform.

III. Where Do We Go From Here?

Respondents suggest that Phase III should be expanded to include comprehensive change or eliminated. An underlying feeling is that "teaching should be rewarded directly without the utilization of complex and time-consuming arrangements." Impatience may increase if Phase III fails to expand or contracts as a result of economic inflation, trivialization or bureaucratic goal-displacement. Time -- and the lack of a sequestered source of money for released time to work on educational reform issues -- is a major problem. Phase III has not succeeded in realizing sabbaticals, extended leaves or substitute teachers for blocks of released time.

1. **Proposals.**

As a minimum addition to other general salary relief proposals which may be made, the following are recommended:

* The $18,000 base salary should be increased to $21,000 for the 1991-2 school year.

* A minimum base salary of $25,000 for all teachers with masters' degrees should be recommended for the 1991-2 school year.

* The minimum base should be applied to community colleges and vocational technical school faculty, if feasible.

* BA and MA base level salaries should be integrated into the salary schedules of all teachers' master contracts.

* The $18,000 minimum base salary or its successor should be applied pro rata per diem to substitute teachers, raising their rate to $100 per day from the present rate which begins at $40.

* A bank of ten released time days, should be made available for every teacher each year and allocated on a building basis by professionals in each building. The state should finance the difference between the number of days presently available and ten. This allows employment of additional full-time or substitute teachers on a long-term (90 day) basis as equal members of a building's instructional team for the purpose of freeing up teachers to work on comprehensive school reform and solving the problem of insufficient time to work change. The cost of such a program would be about $15,000,000 per year.

* One district in each AEA should be selected on a competitive basis to demonstrate comprehensive school transformation from top down to collaborative models on a systems approach applied at the building level. A grant of $50,000 should be made to each district. The cost is $750,000 per year for seven years.

* Phase III funds should be adjusted in all areas annually by the allowable growth factor.

* Disagreements in Phase III Plans should go to interest arbitration.

* Phase III should be integrated into local negotiations, and the Department of Education's authority to approve Phase III plans should be eliminated for the sake of local control.

* There should be more training for administrators on collaborative decision-making. The ISEA should support efforts in this direction proposed by School Administrators of Iowa to the State Board of Education and the Board of Educational Examiners.

* The Department of Education should emphasize a systems approach to change in Phase III as its first priority rather than performance-based pay. In performance-based pay, it should encourage group-based pay for meeting building-level goals through site-based decision-making, rather than individual merit pay.

* The deadline for Phase III plans should be made coterminous with bargaining on March 15.

* If Phase III does not expand to encompass comprehensive school improvement or fails to grow, it should be accreted to existing local programs and a district's cost-per-pupil base.

2. Rationale for Released Time Proposals.

Time to work on educational reform is essential, and time is the missing ingredient. As "time is money," a proposal for improving the availability of time through the utilization of fully licensed, regular and substitute teachers on a semester basis has been provided. The proposal has two parts. First, the $18,000 minimum teachers' beginning salary is applied to substitute teachers. Second,

1. a "bank" of released time equal to ten days for every teacher -- including community college and Area Education Agency teachers -- will be established on an FTE basis;

2. the days will be made available to provide released time for teachers to engage in educational reform in buildings;

3. the "bank" will be allocated by a steering committee of building administrators and teachers elected by peers in a building;

4. the state will finance the difference in cost between a district's presently available number of professional leave days and ten;

or leaving the classroom. Such opportunities will promote retention and create a real career ladder, where teachers have the opportunity to specialize.

6. The proposals permit career flexibility for women. Presently, many leave the profession to raise families. They could remain active if a part-time alternative were available. The proposals provide such an alternative.

7. Substitute teachers are now eligible for bargaining units, according to a recent Supreme Court decision. Their inclusion into bargaining units and building-based educational reform will promote change and provide additional professional expertise.

8. Recent changes in licensure have made it likely that many beginning teachers will enter teaching with the substitute license rather than the Provisional License (Two year probationary license). This is because the new Provisional License lasts two years only and cannot be renewed. The successor (Educational License) cannot be obtained unless one completes "a successful local evaluation" while holding the Provisional License. To obtain the second license one must be employed. Since new graduates often do not have jobs when they graduate, they now take a substitute license. With a substitute license, they are not eligible for the $18,000 minimum salary until they change to the Provisional License. In some places, they would also be ineligible for bargaining unit status and would be denied the protection of the master contract even though they are permanent, full-time and have an expectation of continued employment. If the district should give them the minimum salary anyway, they would be receiving $100/day while substitute teachers in the district receive from $40 per day. Since both are eligible for membership and bargaining unit status, it seems wisest to prevent internal divisions by insuring that all persons with the substitute license -- both regular full-time and temporary -- obtain the $18,000 minimum salary.

9. The ordinary substitute teacher salary rate of from $40/day will be below the minimum wage when the new Iowa minimum wage takes effect. This is a disgrace. It is also impossible for us to accept a two-tiered salary situation -- one for regular teachers and another for substitutes. The history of such arrangements -- at the State and City Universities of New York, and the Des Moines Area Community College -- shows that it divides educators and encourages competitors to seek representation for the disaffected. Double salary schemes have always been bad business for schools, teachers and their organizations, because they undermine equity. The existing double salary situation with substitutes is contrary to our common commitment to equity and should be eliminated.

5. the cost of raising a district's professional leave day-count will be added to the district's per pupil cost in subsequent years by adding the proposal to Phase I; and

6. the percentage of substitutes which may be employed in a building will not exceed 20% of a building's faculty as measured in Full Time Faculty Equivalent.

These proposals are related. The reasons for them are:

1. The proposals address the "time" issue. Lack of time ("control over working conditions") is the number one problem among members. It is necessary that the legislative program address this issue. Some visible and substantive balance between economic and professional issues is required to maintain our credibility on professional matters.

2. The proposals permit extended released time of half-time or more, up to and including a full year's sabbatical, by providing a mechanism for financing such released time and leaves. Although such leaves and additional substitute teachers can be financed by Phase III, they are not being implemented. This is because leave money, substitute teachers' costs and sabbaticals are competing for salary relief money within Phase III. Unless a new and sequestered source of financing is found, these perquisites will remain unavailable. Note that professional development competed with salary in K-12 and was unavailable until Phase III provided a funding source outside of a district's general fund. The same remedy needs to be taken here.

3. The proposals permit teachers to gain released time during the school day to work on educational reform. Many are now working after school on their own time. Teachers and administrators should be encouraged to live normal lives for the sake of their students, families and themselves. They should not donate their time to a school district. Necessary professional duties should be conducted during the school day as much as possible.

4. The proposals bring more adults into the schools. Most national reports on educational reform have seen this as necessary for school transformation. Our proposals place fully qualified and licensed colleagues into the classrooms, not unprepared persons. It is desirable to place more teachers into schools to promote educational reform and increase quality.

5. Use of extended term substitutes (up to 90 days) -- not short term substitutes -- permits teachers to fill new and different professional roles within a district without changing employers

10. Although 71% of teachers are female, 90% of substitutes are female. The proposals promote gender equity.

11. Substitutes are not for the purpose of providing one or two days of released time, but for extended blocks of time. The teacher is responsible only for additional duties, not for supervising the curriculum in the classroom for her substituting colleague. Additional full-time teachers might be hired with the "released time bank." Existing teachers are granted an opportunity for meaningful professional growth and variety. In most cases, the teacher is not taken out of her classroom totally.

12. The proposals advance educational reform by providing a new and sequestered "block grant" for purposes of extended released time. Such an innovation, if provided as a "bank" allocated by steering committees in local buildings, will transform the structure, governance and climate of schools by establishing a building-based decision-making structure. Even if the proposals did nothing else, they should be supported for this alone.

13. The proposals are relatively inexpensive. Assuming that all districts now provide at least 5 days of professional leave on the average on a state-wide basis, the cost of the substitute teacher bank is $15,000,000 based on the higher rate of $100/day. It could be much less.

14. The cost of applying the minimum salary to existing substitute teacher days is, at a maximum, $5,000,000 and is probably much less since it is unlikely that a district, community college or AEA utilizes all budgeted substitute teacher days at a rate approaching even five days per year per teacher.

15. The "bank" proposal can be reduced in cost by (1) bringing it up over several years; and (2) limiting it to districts which have made a commitment to comprehensive educational reform as indicated by a formal readiness survey. Such restrictions would sharpen the intent of Phase III for local districts.

16. The percent of part-time substitutes per building on an FTE bases should be limited to 20%. This is the rate accepted for four-year colleges, and perhaps should be less for K-12. It's necessary to prevent replacing existing full-time FTE teachers with substitutes. The appropriation adds substitutes without decreasing full-time. This is because additional fully licensed adults are needed in schools to provide specialization, individualized attention for the average child, and released time for reform efforts and duties during the school day.

REFERENCES

-------, "Progress Report, Summary of the Implementation of the Educational Excellence Program, Phase III," Ia. Department of Education, Des Moines, Ia., Feb. 29, 1988.

-------, "East Central UniServ Unit Executive Board Survey on Phase III," Iowa State Education Association, Cedar Rapids, Ia., March 1989.

------- "Educational Reform Survey Conducted for the Midwestern Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments," the Roper Organization, Minneapolis, Minn., August 1989.

Dauenbaugh, Lowell "ISEA Membership Survey on Phase III," ISEA, Des Moines, Ia., Feb. 1988.

House File 499, the "Educational Excellence Act," 1987 Iowa Legislative Session.

Oppenheim, Lana; Tilp, Kenneth; Comer, Fred; Sutton, James H.; Walden, Clewis; Shaw, Roy; "Revitalizing Iowa's Public Schools," ISEA, Des Moines, Ia., May 1987.

Walden, Clewis; "Phase II Survey of Delegates," ISEA, Delegate Assembly, Des Moines, Ia., April 1988.

Ott, Gerald; Sutton, James H.; Walden, Clewis; "Revitalizing Iowa's Public Schools," ISEA, Des Moines, Ia., May 1987.

Reinicke, Jan; ISEA internal memo on changes in Phase III as a result of Senate File 38, 1989 Legislative Session, August 30, 1989. Senate File 38, 1989 Legislative Session.

Sutton, James H.; "ISEA Survey of Local Association Presidents on Phase III," ISEA, Des Moines, Ia., May 1989.

Sutton, James H.; "ISEA Membership Survey on Phase III," ISEA, Des Moines, Ia., June 1989.

Theobald, Marie; "Phase III: Restructuring Iowa's Schools, Draft of July 1989, quoted with permission of the Ia. Department of Education, Des Moines, Ia., unpublished, 1989.

Tobin, Lynn and Kreuger, Dennis; "Unit II Phase III Summary," ISEA, Iowa Falls, Ia., Nov., 1988.

Tobin, Lynn and Kreuger, Dennis; "Unit II Phase III Survey," ISEA, Iowa Falls, Ia., May 1989.

Walden, Clewis; "A Report of the Large Locals Phase III Meeting," ISEA, Des Moines, Ia., April 8, 1989.